

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/533,996	SCHMIDT, HARALD	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	DANIEL LEE	1791	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) DANIEL LEE

(2) John Guynn

Date of Interview: 22 March 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  

Claims discussed:

1-20

  

Prior art documents discussed:

  

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*A call was made to John Guynn to discuss the amendment filed February 18, 2010. It was agreed to incorporate dependent claim 2 into independent claim 1 and further clarify that the channels extend through the filter material. It was also agreed to incorporate dependent claim 15 into independent claim 13 to clarify the same and to further limit the diameter of the channels to less than 100 microns. Mr. Guynn provided a proposed amendment after some discussion, and an agreement was reached that an examiner's amendment would place the application in condition for allowance.*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 3:00

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)